REMARKS

Claim Objections

Claims 1-7 and 11-29 were objected to because the phrase "at least in part" was said to be unclear. Independent Claims 1, 11, 15, and 26 are presently amended to clarify the nature of the claimed decoding process.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite. Claim 7 is presently amended to correct a grammatical error that was causing confusion.

35 U.S.C. §101 Rejections

Claims 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter because the claimed article did not result to a practical application. Independent Claim 11 is presently amended to add an additional rendering step, thus producing a useful, concrete and tangible result. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 11-14, as presently amended, are directed to statutory subject matter.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1-10, 15-20, and 26-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Published Application No. US 2003/0189982 to MacInnis (hereinafter *MacInnis '982*). Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-10, 15-20, and 26-29, as presently amended, are patentable over *MacInnis '982*. Claim 1 recites as follows:

> A method comprising:
>
> decoding a first slice of a first frame of a video; and
>
> decoding a second slice of a second frame of the video;
>
> **wherein said first and second slices each comprise a plurality of non-sequential macroblocks that are respectively selected from said first and second frames of the video;**
>
> and wherein some of said decoding a second slice of a second frame of the video is contemporaneous with said decoding a first slice of a first frame of a video.

Independent Claims 8, 15, and 26 recite similar limitations at least insofar as a "slice" of a frame of video is defined as a plurality of **non-sequential** macroblocks. Thus, Claims 1-10, 15-20, and 26-29 are directed at the parallel decoding of groups of macroblocks that are not necessarily adjacent and that are not necessarily in the same row. *See* Fig. 3; page 7, lines 1-3. Both "slice" examples illustrated in Fig. 3 show a selection of non-sequential macroblocks that do not correspond to a single row (or to a group of rows).

By contrast, *MacInnis '982* discloses only that entire **rows** of macroblocks may be decoded in parallel. Indeed, *MacInnis '982* is titled, "System and method for multi-**row** decoding of video with dependent **rows**." Granted, *MacInnis '987* does briefly mention in para [38] that its process could apply to sequential groups of macroblocks that span more than one row, but nowhere does *MacInnis '987* disclose that operations may be performed on collections of macroblocks that are not contiguous and sequential. Aside from one sentence in para [38], *MacInnis '987* disclosures focus exclusively on **rows** of macroblocks, which it defiens as "a set of macroblocks… which span the image from left to right…." *MacInnis '982* para. [7]. Thus, a row is composed of a **sequential, uninterrupted** span of macroblocks.

MacInnis '982 repeatedly discloses that its operations are performed only on rows of macroblocks. *See, e.g., MacInnis '982* para [23] ("the video decode processors 103 operate in parallel, each on a separate **row** of input video data"); [25] ("processors perform the same decoding function in parallel on two or more **rows** of video data"); et al. *MacInnis '982* even goes so far as to state that "any type of system that performs decoding operations in parallel on more than one **row** of compressed video data may benefit from, and falls within the scope of, the present invention." Thus, *MacInnis '987* explicitly does not anticipate parallel decoders that operate on non-row, non-sequential collections of macroblocks. such as those claimed in Claims 1-10, 15-20, and 26-29.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 11-14 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *MacInnis '982*. However, as discussed above with respect to Claims 1-10, 15-20, and 26-29, *MacInnis '982* does not disclose, nor does it even suggest that parallel decoding operations may take place on non-sequential "slices" of macroblocks, as claimed in Claims

11-14 and 24. Therefore, by similar reasoning, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 11-14 and 24, as presently amended, are patentable over *MacInnis '982*.

Claims 21-23 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *MacInnis '982* in view of Published U.S. Application No. US 2004/0057522 to Wu et al. (hereinafter *Wu*). However, as discussed above with respect to Claims 1-10, 15-20, and 26-29, *MacInnis '982* does not disclose, nor does it even suggest that parallel decoding operations may take place on non-sequential "slices" of macroblocks, as claimed in Claims 11-14 and 24. *Wu* does not remedy this deficiency. Therefore, by similar reasoning, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 21-23 and 25, as presently amended, are patentable over *MacInnis '982*.

For at least the reasons above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-29 are allowable and request that the Examiner permit these claims to proceed to issuance. Although additional arguments are believed to exist for distinguishing the cited documents, the arguments presented are believed sufficient to address the Examiner's rejections. Likewise, failure of the Applicants to respond to a position taken by the Examiner is not an indication of acceptance or acquiescence of the Examiner's position. Instead, it is believed that the Examiner's positions are rendered moot by the foregoing arguments, and it is therefore not believed necessary to respond to every position taken by the Examiner with which Applicants do not agree.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early and favorable action allowing all of the pending claims and passing this application to issue is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below if there are any remaining questions regarding this application.

We believe the appropriate fees accompany this transmission. If, however, insufficient fee payment or fee overpayment occurs, the amount may be withdrawn or deposited from/to Axios Law Group's deposit account. The deposit account number is 50-4051.

Respectfully submitted,
AXIOS LAW GROUP

Date: November 5, 2007

by: /Adam L.K. Philipp/
Adam L.K. Philipp
Reg. No.: 42,071
Direct Dial: 206.217.2226

AXIOS LAW GROUP
1525 Fourth Ave, Suite 800
Seattle, WA 98101
Telephone: 206.217.2200
Customer No.: 61857